6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[IX Century]

121
181

subjected agricultural population. In the ruling class of conquerors—who were marrying the native women—the steppe traditions of an unlimited paternal power, centered in a God-like, distant and strict father, tended to prevail. The principles of seniority, of priority of the male sex and of super-ordination and subordination among brothers and sisters favored sibling rivalry in this family system. At the same time, the mother, following her native traditions, tended to assert her marital equality, to maintain separate property rights, to teach her children the native speech and customs, and to protect them against the caprice and wrath of a domineering and warlike father.

[155]

It is likely that children in such families of clashing marital and social philosophies might be exposed to alternating experiences of rejection and over-protection; they might develop an exaggerated self-concern and power-orientation, as well as feelings of inadequacy and dependence. Extremes in emotional reactions ranging from blind submission to destructive aggression and violent revolt tend to develop in such circumstances.

Such traits which contain a core of emotional instability and perpetual strife did not seem to be favorable for the growth and consolidation of State. Instead, a number of small principalities were formed, whose ruling strata were torn by internal rivalries and splits, and by never-ending parricidal and fratricidal feuds. Moreover, these petty princes and war chieftains, following steppe tradition, were interested in waging warfare more than in promoting agriculture or industry—which was contrary to the view of life and the social philosophy of the subjected population. There was, therefore, a lack of common culture, lack of common interests and want of social solidarity between the subjects and their warlike lords. Such a situation fomented social unrest; local riots and mass uprisings, which in turn promoted increasing rigidity of controls, centralization of power, never-ending internal splits and never-ending warfare.

175
795

By the ninth century A.D., these turbulent warriors came into conflict with the Byzantine Empire which had a political interest in the same area. This contact with Byzantium was of far-reaching consequence, because it introduced the Eastern Church into the social and political structure of Russian society. This institu-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

tion has provided moral and ideological foundations for the formation and the expansion of a globally oriented empire, while at the same time, it has also reinforced some of the elements in the structure of the Russian State which have been responsible for its explosiveness and instability.

In the Byzantine politico-religious system, the Church was not only a religious institution but also a political organization, and an arm of the political power. Byzantium therefore undertook to Christianize the Russian lands as a means of political penetration. Following Byzantine Church traditions and practices, the dominant native speech was adopted for Church services. Christianization therefore fostered also Slavization of these regions. Moreover, the Church of Byzantium carried with it the Byzantine concept of unity of Church and State, as well as that of a god-like monarchial power, with the mission to create a Universal Christian Empire.

The Eastern Church also sanctioned unlimited paternal authority and promoted protection-dependency relationships both on politico-administrative and on family levels. This Church sponsored unconditional obedience, attitudes of reverence and gratitude, and feelings of humility and self-effacement, fear and awe in the relations of man to his God, his Prince and his Father. According to the precepts of this Church-State philosophy, the authorities were held responsible for the well-being as well as for the failures and sins of their dependents. Thus the Byzantine Church was preparing psychological and ideological grounds for a politico-religious integration of Russian lands in a system of military theocracy, which became characterized by its Messianic ideology of world redemption and by its dominance-submission and protection-dependency relationships. But such a political system was in sharp conflict with the anarchic view of life and the equalitarian philosophy of family and community relations held by large sections of the population in that area.

This basic internal clash of ideologies in Russian society was intensified in the course of the following centuries when the pressure of the steppe nomads and of the expanding Western empires favored increased militarization, economic regimentation and centralization of total power in the hands of an auto-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

There will be no place to run and hide oneself; it will be woe and pain without comfort, particularly for the repenting sinners. They will see the anger of God, full of rage and wrath, bearing the woe of revenge.[39]

Also the folk religious poetry began to emphasize the gloomy aspects of *post-mortem* life, especially that of the *Strashny Sud*— The Terrible Judgment. It was perhaps in such conditions that Destiny, together with the Truth, became dissociated from the idea of a supreme Justice that reigned everywhere and came to be looked upon as being subject to the caprice of arbitrary and uncontrollable forces that now dominated the Universe.

Such circumstances might have meant quick disintegration of this society, not unlike the rapid dissolution of the Turco-Mongol empires, had it not been for agents that favored the stabilization and the perpetuation of this social system in spite of its internal weaknesses. One of the most important instruments in this process of social consolidation was the Byzantine Church.

5
THE BYZANTINE CHURCH AND MUSCOVITE MILITARY THEOCRACY

I

FOLLOWING the traditions established by the Roman Caesars, the Emperor of Byzantium (Basileus) was looked upon as the supreme war-lord, the sole legislator, and the chief justice, as well as the universal ruler. Therefore, the Church, which was subjected to the absolute and autocratic will of the Emperor, developed a religious ideology in accordance with the dominant political philosophy and practices of the Empire.

The Emperor assumed the duty of defending the Church, combating heresy, and spreading Orthodox faith throughout all the globe. In return, God had promised him universal dominion

1 [Cf. ref. 116, pp. 52-55.—Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

795 771 779 643 over the whole earth.[1] Through the support of the Church the absolute power of the Emperor became sacred, all-comprising and omnipresent. In the proclamation which announced his reign after he has been solemnly anointed by the Patriarch it was stated that he "proceeded from God, and not from man," and that to him, the "supreme master of the universe, absolute obedience was due from all."[2]

795 797 177 It was this Messianic ideology of politico-religious proselytism and world salvation which had united the Church and the state that helped Byzantium to solidify its rule and to spread its influence and control over the neighboring countries. In conquered, dependent and friendly territories numerous bishoprics of Eastern rite were established whose function was to obtain the moral support of the people for the Byzantine ruler. The conquered people were allowed a certain degree of autonomy in their internal affairs and one of their privileges was the right of the use of their native language in church rituals.

This politico-religious expansionism, however, had its weaknesses. The only tie that linked the subjected and the dependent peoples with the central power was the Church. Thus, as soon as the central power and the authority of the Byzantine Emperor weakened as a result of internal feuds, palace revolutions, civil wars, and invasions, some petty local potentates saw a chance to emancipate themselves from Constantinople and proclaim themselves as sovereign rulers. Such a local lord following Byzantine traditions would appoint from his own kinsmen bishops and Patriarchs whose function was to anoint the new king, to bestow upon him God-like qualities, and to sanctify his despotic rule among the subjects.

795 797 648 793 It is this pattern of Church and state relations that also developed between Byzantium and Russia by the end of the tenth century, when as a result of a political alliance with Byzantium Prince Vladimir of Kiev was converted to Christianity.[3] A Greek Metropolitan and a number of Greek Orthodox bishops were subsequently sent to Russia. Having an eye on the control of all other Russian principalities, the Byzantine Church bestowed upon the Metropolitan of Kiev the authority over all Russian

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

territories. He was adorned with the title of the "Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias,"[4] a symbolic beginning of Russian religious and political unity.

When the Tartars in the beginning of the thirteenth century imposed their overlordship over all Russian lands, lacking an efficient administration and interested not so much in governing as in tributes, they restored to the native princes their old titles and gave them the right to collect tributes for them. In this manner in the beginning of the fourteenth century Ivan Kalita of Moscow succeeded in obtaining a *yarlyk* (charter of privileges) in which the Tartar Kahn recognized Ivan as the *Veliky Knyaz* (Grand Prince). A few years later Ivan also became the chief collector of tributes for the Kahn in Russian lands.

In his function as chief farmer of internal revenues Ivan practiced extortion from his Russian subjects and acquired a great personal wealth. His riches enabled him to purchase entire domains and apanages, and to buy the protection and backing of the Kahn. Seeing the ascendency of Ivan, and following Byzantine traditions of Church and state unity, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias moved his residence to Moscow and built a cathedral there, ready to support Moscow princes in their political ambitions.

The expansion of Moscow's power over other Russian lands was favored also by external circumstances and pressures. By the second part of the fourteenth century the central authority of the Tartar Empire, the Golden Horde, had weakened and as was customary in Turco-Mongol society, civil wars ensued among the contenders for the throne. This situation presented an opportunity for power wise princes of Moscow to change their policy of cringing and prostration before the Tartars into that of rebellion and bargain. From now on at times they fought the Tartars, at other times they were again kneeling before them; but they now knew how to take advantage of Tartar weaknesses and how to gain new possessions with Tartar assistance. In this policy of expansion at the expense of other Russian principalities the Muscovites had the support not only of the Khans but that of the Eastern Orthodox clergy as well. Their

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[XVth century]

175 allies were also the local boyars who were traditionally always ready, at the critical moment, to abandon their own local princes and rush to join the ascending power.

[795] In the middle of the fifteenth century, the representatives of the Church of Byzantium, in the hope of obtaining the Pope's help against the Turks, agreed to a union with Rome. However, in Moscow, whose power was ascending in the face of the disintegrating Mongol Empire and where the Turks were not considered a threat, no need was felt for any Latin help. Thus the Metropolitan of Moscow who gave his approval for the union with Rome was deposed and the Russian Church was declared autocephalous and independent of the Greek Patriarch. This break with the Byzantine Church was of far-reaching conse-

[659] quences. It placed the Russian Church into a completely dependent position on the Grand Prince of Moscow. From now on, the objectives of the Russian state and those of the Russian Church became inseparable.

175 Another international event, the fall of Constantinople (1453),
795 removed the last ideological barrier to the growth of the Muscovite Principality into a world empire. Since the seat of the Greek Patriarch had fallen into the hands of the infidels, Moscow became the strongest and the leading Eastern-Orthodox state thus inheriting the Messianic ideology of world salvation and of a Universal Orthodox Empire.

In accordance with such traditions the Russian clergy began to consider Moscow as the only true successor of the first and of the second Rome, as the only depositor of the True Faith, and as the center of a Messianic politico-religious Orthodoxy. By the beginning of the sixteenth century this ideology of the "Third Rome" was fully developed. The Grand Prince of Moscow had already adopted the title of Czar (Caesar). At that time a monk of one of the old monastaries of Pskov stated this idea in a letter to Czar Vasili III, in the following manner:

[126] Two Romes have now fallen, and the third one, our Moscow, yet standeth, and a fourth shall there never be. In thy puissant Empire the council of our church doth shine throughout all the world with the light of holiness which is greater even than the light of the sun. In all the world thou alone art the Christian Tzar.[5]

3: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ties—the state, the Church, the landlords, and the village tax commune—joined hands in backing the collective household system and the power of its head elder.

II

In this manner, under the pressure of circumstances, the *bolshaya* system of jointly ruled community household was gradually giving way to the *otsovskaya* system, that is, the patriarchal family in which the power-oriented steppe traditions tended to take precedence over the Old-Slavonic egalitarianism. Patriarchal traits prevailed especially in the urban strata. The father became absolute master as well as the exclusive owner of the family property in the otsovskaya system. As a result of this change in household structure all family members became economically and personally dependent upon the father; and as long as his power was supported by the state and the Church, they were expected to submit unconditionally to his will; there was no appeal against his arbitrariness, favoritism, and even misbehavior.

As a result of such a development the steppe traditions of life and death power of the father over his wife and children, the relationship of absolute dominance and complete subordination tended to be reinforced and perpetuated. The Church was particularly instrumental in this matter. Under the influence of the Church the father was likened, in the popular mind, to the Almighty. "As God is to the people, so is a father to his children" (*Kak Bog do lyudey, tak otets do detey*),[5] the people would say.

The father had at his disposal a number of ways to impose his will. Owing to the Church teachings, one of the main paternal sanctions consisted of invoking God's wrath This was done by means of malediction or withdrawal of blessing. Parental curse, as well as lack of parental blessing, was certain to bring great misfortune to the disobedient child (*Lisheniem otsovskogo blagoslovenia shchitaetsa chelovekom propashchim.*)[6] The emphasis on need of parental blessing and fear of disastrous consequences of parental curse is stressed in many Great-Russian folk customs and in their folk sayings, folk songs, and folk tales.[7]

Another instrument at the disposal of the father in imposing

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Speaking of the character of the peasants Mr. Karnovitch observed, that whoever has to exercise authority over them must above all things guard against indecision, whether in word or act. The Russian always requires a definite command; and in disputes, if the settlement be distinct and pre-emptory, he will be satisfied, whether the sentence is favorable or unfavorable, wise or unwise. If there be hesitation, he immediately becomes intractable, while a resolute command has a magical influence which he cannot resist.[21]

In such a society which is kept together by naked force rather than by moral bonds, breakdown of controls easily results in revolt and upheavals, in widespread bloodshed and destruction. On such occasions, just like the raznochintsy intelligentsia, the peasants, too, tended to revolt against all forms of humiliation and oppressive submission and demanded reestablishment of the old community relations, in which truth and justice and equalitarian brotherhood of man prevailed.

Such forms of peasant protest, which were directed against all the authorities, the family, community elders, the landlord, the Church and the state, will be discussed on the following pages.

18
RELIGIOUS REVOLT OF THE PEASANTRY

I

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH which in the course of its history came to be completely subjected to the state and was made an instrument of governing, supported the lay authorities in their policies of enserfment. But the state had meagerly rewarded the Church for such services. The revenues from the land donations given to the parishes by the state or by the landlords were not sufficient to maintain the parish priests and their families. The village priests therefore depended for their living upon the fees which the peasants

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

peasants. Such a situation in many cases bred extreme antagonism against the priests, especially when hostility against the priests was stirred up by systematic agitation, as in the case of various sects of Dissenters (*Raskolniki*). This agitation often took the form of folk songs:

hairy ones . . . the beasts:
These beasts are the priests
They howl, like wolves. . . .

• • •

In the churches they praise the Lord hypocritically,
And ensnare innocent people with their words;
In the churches they offer glory to God,
And send the Uryadniks to hunt innocent people;

• • •

And they drive innocent people to Siberia.
In the churches they open their mouths,
But before the government they keep silent.
Their hair is long like women's,
But their brain is a great deal shorter.

• • •

They howl like beasts;

• • •

They extort from all.
Wicked hairy priests . . .[2]

• • •

The peasants were attracted to numerous sects of the Dissenters which were spreading in Russia, especially since the seventeenth century when the great movement of the Old Believers (*Starovery*) began. In these sects and their ideologies the peasants protested against the conditions of serfdom. The teachings of a number of these sects expressed yearning for a new life, and for an anarchic brotherhood of men in which nobody would be rejected and everybody accepted on equal terms. Peasant Sutayev, for instance, who founded the Sutayevtsy sect in 1880, was considered to be one of the most pious churchgoers before he revolted against the official Church. He rebelled when he was over fifty. The occasion was a dispute that he had with his parish priest over a fee for the burial of his grandson. It was after this quarrel that he stopped going to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

church claiming that " . . . one is not better for going there . . . because everything there has to be paid for. Besides, I have the Church within myself."[3]

Sutayev then started a religious crusade aiming at "a new life, the organization of a Christian life." He preached that "the nobles and the rich must give back the land to those to whom it of right belongs." He disapproved of commerce, of money, of private property, of violence, and of any form of coercion. He claimed that if commerce, money and violence were eliminated, then the courts and the tax collectors would disappear too. The tax collectors and all the functionaries who live on the people will not be necessary any more, he said. The army and the war will be suppressed since "all men are brothers." "The Kingdom of God must be brought here on the earth," he asserted.[4] Similar protest against the existing conditions of serfdom and rejection, and demand for an all-human equalitarian brotherhood were expressed in many songs of the Dissenters:

All kinds of ignorance,
Moral wretchedness,
Falsehood and inconsistency,
Baseness, hypocrisy,
Coarse superstition,
Are contrary to Christianity!
Slavery, oppression,
Violence, constraint,
Every sort of pressure against people—
All this—
Is abomination before God,
Transgression of his commandments.
All people on earth
Are the children of one mother,
And above God there is no power.
And all without regard to standing in society,
Should be equal
And free in their conscience.
Everyone can pray,
According to what seems to him,
To be his obligation in relation to God.

3: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[538]
795
771

• • •

Why then in deeds of faith
Measures of compulsion
And all kinds of constraint?

• • •

Why then is this?[5]

795 641 Protest against the existing conditions of abusive dominance and subservient submission and longing for acceptance on terms of anarchic equality seems to have been the driving power behind the ideologies of a number of Great-Russian religious sects, such as the *Dukhobortsy* (the spirit-wrestlers), and the *Molokane* (the milk-drinkers). Not unlike the Nihilists and the Anarchists (whose reaction was also rooted in feelings of rejection), all these sects showed a strong resentment against abusive and distant authorities. At first the religious dissenters attacked the Church authorities but then this anti-authority attitude was generalized and extended to all the authorities, including the family, the landlords, the state and the Czar.

As a result all the authorities were blamed for the existing social ills and their removal was considered necessary in order to achieve a better life. There was no need for official clergy, courts, churches, sacraments, fasts, confession, communion, or any Church rituals except simple hymn singing, these sects said. There was no need for the Czar either, they claimed. Anything that smacked of authority and power was rejected. "We behold what a spirit of impiety works and shall work to the end of the world in all holders of power," they stated.[6] In 1868, a sect decreed that anyone who prays for the existing authorities shall be excommunicated. Now all the authorities, not just the priests, were identified with the beasts! "How will you ever find grace at the hands of the Beast?" A number of these sects identified the Czar with the Anti-Christ.

795 156 In their reaction against the suppression of the individual in the interest of those who hold power and in their strongly felt need for acceptance on terms of complete equality, the Dukhobortsy—not unlike the Nihilists—proclaimed the supremacy and the sanctity of the individual. Their demand for an anarchic acceptance was manifested in the emphasis of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

worth and dignity of the individual above all other values; the Dukhobortsy claimed that every human being was a god. "God is spirit; he is in us; then we are gods."[7]

Disapproval of oppressive authority on the family level led the Dukhobortsy to repudiate even the names of "father" and "mother." They therefore did not call their parents "father" and "mother," but only "old man" and "old woman." In the same way a father would not say of his children "mine," but "ours."[8] Proscribing the existing degrading subjection of the wife to her husband the Dukhobortsy—not unlike the early Slavs—stressed the complete equality of men and women, husbands and wives. "Among us a woman is not a beast of burden, but a helpmate and standby, a friend and companion in this vale of misery," the Molokane would say.[9] The men called their wives "sisters."

To satisfy their demands for complete acceptance and anarchic relations the Molokane attempted to build a society in which all things were to be possessed in common, and in which the evangelic principles of charity and equality, and the gospel of peace, truth and justice would reign supreme and forever.[10] They felt that it was only in such a communistic society that complete acceptance of all on equal terms could be achieved.

II

Just as in the ideology and practices of Russian monasticism, in some sects of the Dissenters reaction against the oppressive conditions and feeling of utter rejection took the form of extreme social withdrawal. For instance, the *Straniki* (wanderers) proscribed marriage and all family ties, and sought salvation in isolation and flight as the only way to avoid any contact with "Satan's representatives," that is, with the authorities. They would destroy and reject passports and all papers of identification, admit of no social distinction or ties, renounce private property and tramp from village to village, living by theft or by the hospitality of their sympathizers who provided food and secret shelter for them. "Have no city, no village, no home," they would advise.[11]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

795 156 Another manifestation of withdrawal from degrading oppression was expressed by the *Molchalniki* (speechless) or *Bezslovestnye* (mutes), the sect whose members refused to speak. The moment one would join this sect he would suddenly become dumb and nothing could force even a syllable from his lips. The government was unable to obtain any information from such voluntary martyrs,[12] even under extreme torture.[13] The Theodosians and the Denisovtsy manifested feelings of dejection and withdrawal by means of complete asceticism. These sects demanded celibacy and abstinence not only from bachelors, but from married people as well. ("Let the unwedded wed not, the wedded separate"). The members of these sects therefore [792] founded settlements which were organized along monastic lines, where they attempted to live a solitary life of complete seclusion in the wilderness, and far away from worldly authorities.[14]

On the other hand, some sects apparently reacted to the existing unsatisfactory conditions by various forms of destructive aggressiveness, including self-destruction. The *Skoptsy* (castrated), for instance, practiced castration and mutilation of sex organs.[15] Other sects preached and practiced mass assassination and mass immolation. The *De'oubiytsy* (infant-killers), preached and practiced infanticide. The *Dushilshchiki* (stranglers) or *Tyukalshchiki* (clubbers) preached and practiced killing of adults.[16] Other sects, such as the *Samoszhigateli* (self-cremators) of *Morelshchiki* (self-immolators), organized mass immolation. Cases of such acts of extreme destructiveness have occurred until the end of the nineteenth century, and in the most different and distant parts of the Empire where the Great-Russians are settled.[17] As among the Anarchists, there was among these people an urge for pan-destruction:

> I wish that all Romanov, every man, wife, and child, would come to the banks of the Volga, throw themselves into the waters, and sink to the bottom so that the temptations of the world should not attract them. And what is even better: that I might set fire to and burn down the entire city;—what joy if it were to burn from end to end destroying all the aged and infants, so that none could receive the stamp of Antichrist.[18]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

III

Just as in the ideology of Nihilism and Anarchism, revolt against degrading submission and rejection and demand for acceptance in some sects took the form of extreme power-seeking and self-deification. In the sect *Lyudi Bozhii* (people of God), for instance, the craving to become God incarnate or to have a live incarnation of Deity actually present in their midst was so strong that since the time of the sect's founder who claimed to be God Zebaoth (Sabaoth) a whole series of Christs came into being, succeeding one another by a sort of filiation or adoption. Finally each religious community of this sect boasted of having a flesh-and-blood Christ in its midst. They claimed that it was in each man's own power to unite himself to the Deity and to incarnate it in his own body. A woman had the faculty to become *Boginya* (the Goddess) or *Bogoroditsa* (Mother of God) and many women did achieve such self-apotheosis, adding to the number of divinities of each community.[19]

It was by means of suffering and mortification of flesh that candidates for Messiahship competed among themselves for this supreme achievement. These exploits were accompanied with self-glorification. In this way both power-seeking and identification with suffering were realized. The followers would watch for years to see which of the rival pretenders to Christhood underwent the greatest sufferings. The rivals for Godship, on the other hand, often resorted to trickery to prove their claims.[20] But once the issue was settled and a God-incarnate was recognized, the whole congregation owed Him supreme reverence and unconditional obedience which satisfied the contender's craving for power: "I am God, foretold of the prophets. There is no other God than I. Seek ye none other. Where unto ye are appointed, abide therein."[21] On the part of the congregation the desire for Christ-incarnate in their midst manifested a strong need for protective dependence and acceptance.

Hence longing for a world in which truth and justice, kindness and love would reign, in which there would be no abusive serfdom, no subservience, tortures and sufferings, but happi-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

795
577
771

ness, trust and all-human equality and fraternal aid was strongly felt in these sects. Many of these people expressed such yearnings in the form of religious hymns and rituals. It is to be expected that in these hymns and practices Christ and Mother of God, symbols of love and acceptance, not "Old God," symbol of rage and fear, would be worshipped and longed for:

The Czardom of Truth will be restored
Amongst us here on earth,
And the flame of heavenly life
Will be rekindled in our midst.
Only then, when malice and slander
Disappear from the face of earth,
And man acknowledges the Lord,
God of everlasting love,
When the world replaces pride and hypocrisy
With Truth and Justice of God,
And in the yearnings of the noble soul
Love and kindness are revived,
When all are equal under God
And the weak no longer are oppressed,
When man his thoughts to Lord will turn
And spread Truth and Justice of God,
When the force of dismal prisons, tortures and shackles
No longer reigns,
The living God will resurrect
Eternal freedom in the heart of man.
To this Czardom, thou seeker of God,
Hasten and sincerely yearn for
With a clear heart, tirelessly,
Pray thou to the Creator of the universe.
For to sow the seeds of good and love,
Are we summoned by the Lord;
So that torture and death do not appall us
In the living of our days,
We will have to be the executors
Of the Holy conceptions of Christ
Then the Czardom of Truth of God
Will tread upon the earth.
We shall have the destiny
Of creating Christ's Family.

G; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

This is great fortune
For all the servants of the world,
Sharers in honesty and trust,
Executors of the Covenant of Christ.[22]

Longing for acceptance was not only manifested in the worship of living "Christ," but also in carnal communion with the "Christs" and "Madonnas," in ecstatic trances and mass religious hallucinations, and apparently even in some cannibalistic practices.[23] Thus when in consequence of sacred rites a Bogorodica would bear a child, if a boy, he was known as *Khristosik* (the little Christ). According to some students of Russia's religious life the Khristosik was immolated on the eighth day after his birth. His heart and blood, mixed with flour and honey, were served to make the cakes for the Eucharist. This practice was called "Taking Communion in the blood of the Lamb."[24] At other times, according to the same sources, it was a young virgin, chosen as Mother of God who willingly gave her left breast to be cut out amidst ritual dancing and singing. The breast was then partaken of as the "true Eucharistic food."[25]

Great emotional insecurity and extreme fear of rejection might explain why elements of power-seeking were present in all sects, even in those which professed complete repudiation of power in any form whatsoever. For instance, Popov, the founder of the Molokane sect which originally professed complete freedom of conscience and complete equality, eventually entirely suppressed liberty of discussion and interpretation. Unconditional submission to the authorities he declared to be the first duty, insubordination the greatest sin.[26] Andrey Selivanov, the founder of the Skoptsy sect, had himself designated in the prayers which were addressed to him in his lifetime, as "God of Gods and King of Kings," even though the Skoptsy sect professed complete freedom from any form of coercion.[27]

Also early in the history of the Dukhobortsy we find that their communistic practices finally led to dictatorship and despotism.[28] The leaders of this sect knew how to take personal advantage of the longing of the sect members for protective dependence and acceptance. One of the leaders of this sect, Kapustin, in the beginning of the nineteenth century expounded

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the communistic tenets of the Dukhobortsy in such a way as to turn them to his own profit and advantage. Like other Dukhobortsy, Kapustin too believed that God was in every man, and therefore all men were equal. He said, however, that God first had revealed himself in Jesus and the soul of Jesus has then continually animated new bodies throughout many generations. And by virtue of its higher qualities, and the absolute command of God, the soul of Jesus as it passed from one man to another had invariably retained its identity, and the man in whom the soul of Jesus resided, unmistakenly knew he was Jesus:

> Thus Sylvan Kolisnikof at Nikisk whom many of older among you knew, was Jesus; but now, as truly as the heaven is above and the earth under my feet, I am the true Jesus Christ, your Lord! fall down therefore on your knees and worship me![28]

Kapustin introduced a complete community of goods among his followers. They worked the fields in common and divided the harvest among them. Storehouses were erected to provide against years of dearth or famine. Also various kinds of industries were introduced and the colony showed visible progress in the first few years of its existence. Kapustin had also assembled an advisory Council of thirty Elders about him, from among whom an inner circle of twelve was selected. These were known as "The Apostles." Before he died he endeavored to impose his son as his successor and claimed that when he died the soul of Jesus would enter the body of his son.

After Kapustin's death dissatisfactions grew stronger and manifested themselves in suspicion, mistrust, and denunciation. The Council of Elders developed into an inquisitional tribunal which ruled arbitrarily, interpreting justice according to their caprices. Those who submitted unconditionally were rewarded, those who were suspected of deviation were accused of treachery and of intention to go over to their "enemy" that is, the official Church, and were punished with torture and even with death. The house from which the Elders ruled became known as *Ray i muka*—paradise and torture.[29]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

792 one of the outstanding tenets in the philosophy of Russian monas-
829 577 ticism whose history is even longer than that of the Czardom was
[795] charitable love. Many sects of the *Raskolniki* propagated and practiced principles of humaneness. The Slavophils were especially prominent in advocating the return to an idealized stateless society of benevolent paternalism where brotherhood, Chris-
829 577 [177] tian love, and compassion would reign. The "Westerners" endeavored to introduce into Russia Western concepts of justice and tolerance, and a humanistic, libertarian and juridical state. Russian belles-lettres, Russian school textbooks, as well as laws and regulations in the nineteenth century and up to the beginning of World War I, bear witness to this trend toward Westernization and humanism.

178 661 In Soviet Russia, on the other hand, after a brief initial period of reaction against the old regime which led toward an emphasis on all-human values and equalitarian brotherhood, soon the trend of events pushed the Bolshevik ideology in the opposite direction. The determination of a ruling clique of professional conspirators to maintain themselves in power by any and all means dictated the emphasis on the internal and external "threats" which would justify the intensification of internal "measures of security," and of external aggression. Thus vigilantism and war preparedness, and expansion of internal and external Bolshevik power, became the main base of the policies of the ruling class.[25] Such policies had to be constantly reinforced by a deliberate incitement to hatred and destruction.

661 672 The image of Soviet society as being in a constant state of war, not only against foreign enemies but against internal oppositionists, deviationists, spies, saboteurs, and remnants of bourgeois mentality has been determined by a social structure which the Bolshevik rulers themselves have created, but which makes their own power uncertain and precarious. In such circumstances Lenin's idea of a life and death struggle with the "class enemies," the idea that "it's them or us" (*Kto kogo*) has provided the main motivating force of the Party's internal and foreign policies. Fearing to be annihilated unless they themselves destroy their enemies, conscious that they have "either to rule or to die," the Bolsheviks have ruthlessly applied the principle of "obedience

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

CHAPTER VII

RUSSIA

THE important fact about Russian civilization is that it is Byzantine in its origin, and that in spite of what Toynbee refers to as Russia's "fits of Westernization", its convulsions due to the injection of ideas from the West, (e.g., under Peter the Great), and again in its adoption of Marxism, Byzantine it has remained.

If anyone cares to dispute this about Russian civilization as a whole, he can hardly do so about the Russian Church in particular. In the eleventh century the Russians, or rather their Scandinavian rulers, took over Orthodoxy as one whole thing from Constantinople. It was the reverse process of what happened in the Roman Empire when the State adopted Christianity after it had largely won the people. In Russia the princes accepted Christianity and then gradually imposed it upon their subjects. Christianity had a thousand years' experience behind it, and Orthodoxy had reached its final form when Russia embraced it. No disputes about fundamental Christian doctrines disturbed the Russian Church. The Trinitarian and Christological controversies were settled, the marriage of Christian revelation with Greek philosophy had been consummated, and the conflict to settle the relations between religion and art had been fought out. Together with the liturgical books and all the external apparatus of worship, Russia took over a fixed body of doctrine, a monastic system, a style of building and ornamenting churches, and a body of legal principles.

In all these matters Russia was to introduce modifications and to set a Russian stamp upon them, for in spite of its method of adoption Orthodoxy entered into the soul of the

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

Russian people and became its very life. But the Byzantine character of Russian religion was conserved. As we have already seen the Russian Church was for long dependent upon Constantinople. Its literature consisted of translations or imitations of Byzantine writings. Its Metropolitan was a Greek consecrated in Constantinople and sent to rule the Russian Church. The two exceptions provided by the appointment in Russia of Hilarion in 1051 and Clement in 1147 are regarded as isolated cases which did not impair the theory and change the practice, which held good till 1448.

Politically the Russians lived for a century and a half under Mongol domination. From the battle of Kalka in 1223 the onslaughts of these mysterious, hideous and inhuman hordes, suddenly appearing from whence no man knew, burning, killing, capturing, had struck terror into the hearts of the dwellers on the Russian plain. Kiev, the cradle of Russian Christianity, the ancient and beautiful stronghold on the Dnieper, was sacked in 1240, and one by one the rest of the Russian towns speedily succumbed. Novgorod alone escaped, protected by its remote situation behind its marshes and forests, and by the courage, self-sacrifice and political wisdom of its prince, St. Alexander Nevsky. The Tartar rule bore less heavily upon the Church than upon the State. When their victory was assured the Tartars were at first, in matters of religion, easy-going pagans, and so long as they received their tribute, did not interfere unduly with the religion of the people they conquered. And as was also to be the case later on with the Balkan peoples under the Turk, it was their religion and their Church which, in the days of social and political disaster, saved the Russians from complete despair and preserved among them some sense of fundamental unity in spite of all their factions and divisions.

The Russian Church was the nurse of the growing national spirit of Russia. In the person of one of its great national saints, Sergius of Radonezh, who founded the Monastery of the Holy Trinity near Moscow, for centuries the citadel of Russian religion and national aspiration, it inspired the movement which thrust back the Tartar domination. In 1380 Dmitry of the Don, whose building of stone walls round Moscow had been a challenging gesture to which the Tartars were not slow

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia KF1

to respond, came to seek the advice of St. Sergius and received the calm assurance: "Go forward and fear not, God will be with thee." Everything was at stake, including Russian religion, for the Tartars had by this time embraced Islam, and their easy-going tolerance of Christianity was a thing of the past. The hard-fought wavering battle of Kulikovo Pole followed and ended in a Russian victory, and the beginning of the end of the Tartar dominance.

Much missionary activity was displayed by the Russian Church during the period of Tartar domination. Even among the Tartars themselves this evangelistic work was carried on, while many a lonely outpost of monastic life in the forests and swamps of the north spread the faith of Christ in regions where it had been unknown before. Few names of individual pioneers have been handed down, but among them is that of the energetic missionary bishop, Stephen of Perm.

After the fall of Kiev, the centre of gravity in Russian life, both political and ecclesiastical, had moved northwards, first to Vladimir and finally to Moscow, around which Ivan the Great and his son Vasili IV built up the Tsardom of Muscovy at the close of the Tartar period.

It was at first but a small area in the centre of what is modern European Russia. Kiev and the south were not under its control, nor did it extend to the Baltic. It had no port until the commercial enterprise of the Englishman, Richard Chancellor and his fellow traders, provided one at Archangel in the sixteenth century. But to the east expansion was to prove surprisingly easy, the counterflow to the Tartar invasion swept into Siberia under Yermak towards the end of the sixteenth century, and the colonists that followed bringing the life and religion of Russia were soon to reach the shores of the Pacific.

But to return to the fifteenth century, the Tsardom of Moscow was for long to remain the only Orthodox Christian realm free from foreign and non-Christian suzerainty, and it became aware of itself as the heir of Constantinople. Nor were the Russians unwilling to see their Church play the leading rôle in Orthodox Christendom. From their point of view Constantinople had deserved its fate, for its act of apostasy in accepting the terms of Union at Florence. A Greek named

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

Isidore had been appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople to be Metropolitan of Moscow. Isidore represented the Russian Church at Florence and in company with the other Easterns (except Mark of Ephesus) he signed the Act of Union, which two years later, on his leisurely return to Moscow, he caused to be solemnly read at the Liturgy in the Uspensky Cathedral. The response of his flock was to arrest him and imprison him in a monastery. He escaped and fled to Rome and the Russians elected their own Metropolitan in his place. The fact that Constantinople accepted, even for a time only, the Florentine terms of Union which the Russians themselves so energetically repudiated, convinced them that Constantinople had betrayed the Orthodox Faith, and the fall of that city so soon afterwards seemed to them to set the seal of divine approval upon their judgment.

It is a matter of some surprise that the Russian Church was content to remain for so long a period in its dependent position and did not claim its autocephalicity until 1448. Long before that date the number of its bishops far exceeded what was required for a Church to become autocephalous. Its adherents were ethnically different from those of its mother Church, and the difference of language between them must have been a source of difficulty. Politically the Russians owed allegiance to their Tsar, and were not subjects of Constantinople. Geographically they were far removed from the administrative centre of the mother Church and communication involved much expenditure of time, considerable inconvenience and some danger. There would seem then to be ample grounds for the independence of the Russian Church to be claimed and granted long before it was. On the other hand there were clear advantages accruing from the fact that the Metropolitan was a Greek who came from abroad and owed ecclesiastical allegiance outside Russian territory. It enabled him with impartiality and with better hope of success to mediate in the constant feuds which rent the early Russian State. It assisted the Church to play its part as peacemaker and a unifying power. The Russian princes themselves were often wise enough to recognize this.

A Russian writer[1] has recently claimed the reverence of

[1] S. Troitsky in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, July, 1948.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

795 the Russians for ecclesiastical law as a further reason for the delayed independence of the Russian Church. For the canons require the consent of the mother Church before the daughter can become autocephalous, and Constantinople was reluctant to give this consent. "The income which Constantinople received from the broad and rich Metropoly of Russia formed a huge item in the Patriarchal budget." It is, however, not fair to assume that Constantinople was actuated entirely by mercenary motives. However that may be, in the end the Russians took the matter into their own hands, regarding themselves as absolved from their canonical obedience by the fact that in their view Constantinople had lapsed into heresy by accepting the Union of Florence.[1]

795 Thus the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the submergence
186 of the Balkans beneath the flood of Turkish invasion, roughly coincided with the emergence of Russia from beneath the yoke of the Tartars. As Orthodoxy was eclipsed in the south, it arose with new strength and splendour in the north and Moscow picked up the torch which fell from the dying hand of Constantinople. The legend of "Moscow the Third Rome" came to birth as the inspiration and expression of this renewal of life and ambition among the Russians after their long experience of depression under the Mongols, and brought with it a sense of their responsibility for the future destiny of Orthodoxy in history and of a Russian mission to the world. The message of the monk Philotheus to the Tsar Vasili III (1505 to 1533) assuring him that although two Romes had fallen a third had risen in the north which should never pass away, and acclaiming him as the supreme and only Christian ruler in the world, long haunted the minds of the Russians, and was expressly endorsed by the Stoglav Council in 1551 (see below, p. 101). A surprising ancestry was discovered for the Russian ruler, whose line of descent was traced back to the imperial house of ancient Rome, if not beyond. Correspondingly he assumed the imperial title, he became Tsar (Caesar) and "autocrat".

[1] According to the writer just quoted the Russians did apply in due form for the consent of Constantinople to the consecration of their nominee Jonah as Metropolitan of Moscow in 1448, but there is no evidence that any reply was received.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

795
659

Thus Church and State developed side by side and often worked harmoniously together. As time went on, however, the Metropolitan came to be more and more dependent upon the Tsar, who on more than one occasion dispensed with the form of election altogether and frankly appointed his chief bishop himself, a course of action for which Constantinople had supplied precedents. A case in point is that of the Metropolitan Daniel, and it is involved in the controversy between the Possessors and the Non-possessors which divided ecclesiastics in sixteenth-century Russia.

The Non-possessors desired a reform of the monasteries and in particular disapproved of the possession of landed property by monks whose vow of poverty, they held, should apply corporately as well as individually. They were led by scholars and mystics like Maxim the Greek and Nil Sorsky. The Possessors, under Joseph of Volokalamsk, while holding the opposite opinion on the subject of monastic property, were supporters of the steadily increasing autocracy of the Tsar, whereas their opponents took a more liberal and humane view both about the authority of the State and about the exercise of discipline upon heretics, whom Joseph and his friends felt little compunction in calling upon the secular arm to destroy. The Tsar Vasili III was childless and proposed to divorce his wife and marry another woman. The Metropolitan Barlaam whose sympathies inclined to the Non-possessors refused to sanction this or to perform the ceremony. He paid for his principles by life imprisonment in a monastery, and a pliant Possessor was found in the person of Daniel whom Vasili made Metropolitan in his place and by whom the new marriage was solemnized. Moralists have not failed to point out that the fruit of this marriage was Ivan the Terrible.

The dispute between the Possessors and Non-possessors went on. Some legal adjustments were introduced into the hitherto unrestricted right to bequeath lands to the religious houses. The celebrated Council of the Hundred Chapters or Stoglav[1] which met in 1551 enacted certain reforming measures,

[1] *Sto* means one hundred, and *glav* means chapter. The enactments of the Council were divided into a hundred chapters. Hence the name Stoglav, which is applied both to the document and to the Council which produced it.

10: French . S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

•795
659

some of which were concerned with the monastic life. But the core of the Council was conservative and it set the seal of its sanction upon the general pattern of Russian life. It authorized a revision of the Service books, though little came of the authorization. It pronounced in favour of the old Russian customs in making the sign of the Cross and the singing of Alleluia. All these were matters which were to give much trouble to the Patriarch Nikon later on (see below, p. 103).

The differences between the Possessors and Non-possessors on the ethical and humanitarian sides of their controversy remained unresolved, and in general Nil Sorsky failed to establish the ideals he desired in Russian monastic life, and to secure the acceptance of more humane principles in the treatment of heretics. In this respect perhaps he lived before his time. More than a century later two deacons whose wives had died of the plague had forsaken their ministry and married again. They were sent to prison to be kept without food until they perished, and only escaped this fate through the special intercession of the Patriarch of Antioch who was in Moscow at the time.

As the power and dignity of the Russian Tsar increased, it seemed but fitting that his chief bishop should have a corresponding status and receive the supreme ecclesiastical title. With little difficulty this was achieved in 1589 and the title of Patriarch of Moscow was conferred upon the Metropolitan Job and subsequently recognized by the other Eastern Patriarchs.

Thus Russia became the fifth Patriarchate of the Church, and was held, in some sense, to have taken the place of Rome, which had "fallen away". The assumption of this new dignity was accompanied by the creation of a number of new Russian dioceses, and the raising of others to Metropolitan rank.

A generation later Russia again lay under the heel of an invader. The period of disturbances and civil war known as the Troublous Times brought with it foreign invasion. The Poles overran Russia and were in possession of Moscow. For sixteen months they had been laying siege to the famous Monastery of the Holy Trinity a few miles away. Then a dramatic episode occurred. In response to letters sent out from

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples

Great Russia RF1

795 659

the Monastery a great patriotic host came to its rescue under the leadership of a prince, a butcher, a monk and a Cossack, drove out the Poles, and established Michael as the first Tsar of the House of Romanov and his father Philaret as Patriarch. The House of Romanov was to last until the collapse of imperial Russia, and the advent of the Soviets. The Patriarchate was not so long lived. But in addition to Philaret himself it produced at least one outstanding figure in the vigorous personality of Nikon.

793 659

Nikon, of peasant origin, was a rigorist, vigorous and dominating, sincere and ascetic. As head of the Chudov monastery in Moscow he had been the close friend and adviser of the Tsar Alexis, the devout son and successor of Michael, for some years, when in 1652 with a good deal of reluctance and some stipulations he yielded to the Tsar's entreaties and accepted the Patriarchal Throne. Perhaps he foresaw that his own personality and conception of his duty as Patriarch were bound to clash with those of his friend and sovereign. Such in fact proved to be the case. Nikon felt himself bound in conscience to resist the encroachments of the secular power in the realm of spiritual affairs. But at the same time he had little scruple about intruding his own will into secular matters, where his harsh severity and arrogance made him many enemies among the boyars.

793 779

There was another aspect of the troubles which were to gather around Nikon and in the end overwhelm him. It was the question of the revision of the Service books of the Church —a thorny matter on which many men both in Russia and elsewhere have pricked their fingers.

The Old Slavonic books used by the Russian Church had been translated from the Greek, and in the course of centuries of transcribing, minor errors had inadvertently crept into the text. Beside these matters there were other questions in dispute, such as whether the sign of the Cross should be made with two fingers in the Russian manner or with three as the Greeks were accustomed to make it. And how often should Alleluia be sung on certain occasions? One may be pardoned some astonishment at the fury of the passions aroused by the mere discussion of these subjects. But this is to misunderstand. Men

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RFI

of the Greek visitors were acquiesced in. This did not add to Nikon's already scanty popularity, especially when he proclaimed with more honesty than tact: "I am a Russian and the son of a Russian but my faith and religion are Greek."

Even Avvakum had been prepared to amend the Russian books from the older Slavonic editions and manuscripts. But that was before Nikon's day as Patriarch, and when the latter proposed to appeal to the Greeks as the criterion, Avvakum and his friends from being moderate reformers went into the most violent and unappeasable opposition.

Avvakum was a remarkable man and he could write. He was in fact the most outstanding figure in Russian literature before Peter the Great. His autobiography which has been translated into English, should certainly be read. He defied the authorities with implacable obstinacy, goaded them with virulent abuse, suffered untold hardships as a consequence and in the end won the martyr's crown which he so eagerly desired.

In due course, the conflict between the ecclesiastical authorities and Avvakum's party (for he had many friends and sympathizers) developed into an open schism which has persisted to this day. Thus Russian Dissent, unlike English, owes its origin to opposition to reform, not to the advocacy of it. The Old Believers, as the dissenting party was called, became highly fissiparous and sometimes most eccentric. They suffered much persecution over a long period of time. "But on the whole," to quote Prince Mirsky,[1] "they have been the truest —in many cases the only—preservers of pre-Petrine Russian civilization. Were it not for them our contemporaries would hardly have rediscovered the Church music of Old Russia, nor the boundless wealth of its religious painting, which is the purest, strongest and most original flower of Old Russian civilization."

Nikon won against the Old Believers, but he lost against the nobility, which succeeded in detaching the sympathies of the Tsar from the Patriarch. The same Council which in 1667, in the presence of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch,

[1] In his introduction to *The Life of the Archpriest Avvakum by Himself* The Hogarth Press, 1924.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

confusion into Russian life. The Court and governing classes in St. Petersburg became the least Russian of all sections of the nation, indeed they were more German than Russian, and for long the reform of Peter affected only the educated classes of society. Behind the St. Petersburg façade was the great mass of the people who continued to regard everything Western with suspicion and even abhorrence. Nevertheless, the movement gradually made headway and in due course the interplay of Western ideas and native Russian thought was to produce modern Russian culture and especially the astonishing achievement of Russian nineteenth-century literature.

The "Westernizers" who believed that the destiny of Russia was to follow the path of the West, and the "Slavophils" who put their faith in the Orthodox tradition of native Russian culture, sharpened their wits upon each other in drawing-room discussions and set forth their views in books. But behind all this and but little affected by it, the religious life of the Russian people went on as before. The official Church and the majority of the hierarchy supported the Government even if they disapproved of things Western. Tsar and Metropolitan needed each other, for each believed that in the preservation of the other his own well-being was involved.

But the schism inherited from the seventeenth century still continued and the "Old Believers", among whom was conserved much that was most profound and sincere in the traditional religion of Russia, would have no truck with the St. Petersburg Empire which was anathema to them, nor with the official Church which had come to terms with it. There were in course of time many groups of these interesting schismatics, some of whom had a clergy and some had not. If sections of them degenerated into sects which were psychologically abnormal, the bulk of them, consolidated by persecution and fanatically tenacious of their beliefs, upheld a high standard of conduct and their communities were a storehouse of many significant and beautiful elements of Russian Orthodoxy. Although after 1800 some availed themselves of more generous terms offered them for reconciliation to the Church, the Old Believers exist to this day as a well-organized body of some millions under their own bishops.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

795 The Old Believers maintain, not without some show of reason, that it is the official Church which has left them, not *vice versa*. But in any case the vast bulk of the Russian people remained within the fold of that official Church. They lived their lives in close contact with their village churches oblivious of the disputes of Slavophils and Westernizers, pathetically constant in their belief in their Little Father, the Orthodox Tsar, and shocked but silent if they heard of time-serving prelates. Nor were men lacking to guide and uphold them. In the eighteenth century Tikhon Zadonsky is an instance of the devout hard-working and conscientious bishop by no means rare in post-Petrine Russia.[1] He stayed at his episcopal post although yearning for the life of secluded devotion for which he had to wait so many years. Some reflection of this man's personality is to be seen in the portrayal of Zossima in Dostoyevsky's *Brothers Karamazov*. In the monasteries were to be found men conspicuous for their sanctity and well qualified to give advice and spiritual help to the many who sought them out. Zossima is not alone in Russian literature and the counterparts of these men in real life, such as St. Serafim of Sarov, Ambrosius of the Monastery of Optina, and many less well-known men of the kind, stand in the true line of descent from Nil Sorsky, in their spirituality and unworldliness and their essentially Russian love of freedom.

747 The vitality of the Russian Church during the period after Peter and especially in the nineteenth century found expression in widespread missionary activity (see below, p. 162). If the expansion of the Church took place together with the expansion of the Empire, if the missionary bishop worked hand in hand with the secular official and imposed Russian religion and Russian rule at the same time, who is to say which was the dominating motive? At any rate it cannot be said that the Russian Church was blind or indifferent to the spiritual needs of its pagan fellow subjects of the Tsar. But if the State was 657 benevolently interested in the Church, it was determined to 793 control it, and the position of outstanding men like Platon under Katharine II and Paul, and Philaret under Alexander I

[1] Gorodetsky: *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*, pp. 99 ff.